

5. EFFECTS OF ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED TO THE CORPS FOR CONSIDERATION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the hydrologic, water quality, sedimentation and erosion, ice, economic, and environmental effects of the alternatives submitted by several entities to the Corps for consideration as the Corps moves through the process of determining what the future water control plan should be for the Mainstem Reservoir System. Table 5.1-1 lists the entities and the corresponding names of the alternatives to be discussed in this chapter of the RDEIS. The American Rivers (AR), and the Missouri River Natural Resources Committee (MRNRC) submittals had many similarities, including spring rises downstream from Fort Peck and Gavins Point Dams and a split navigation season on the Lower River. After discussions with both entities, the Corps combined these two submittals into a single alternative that was identified as the ARNRC alternative. Most of the components of the AR alternative were combined with some specific components identified in the submittal for the MRNRC alternative. This left six alternatives to the current Water Control Plan (CWCP) for consideration. Detailed information on the components of these alternatives is included in Chapter 4.

For this chapter, the effects of these six alternatives are compared primarily to those of the CWCP, with limited comparison of the impacts of the alternatives with each other. The effects are presented in a variety of ways from average annual data to annual data. In some cases, more detailed data is presented to provide the reader with data

that more closely match the areas of concern that have been expressed throughout the study process in general, and more specifically during the preparation of this RDEIS.

Because of the distinct differences and unique combination of components in each alternative, delineation of the component of each plan that may be causing the differences among the alternatives is sometimes difficult to identify. With some of the more detailed data presented in this chapter, one will be able to get a general feeling for these differences. The reader is encouraged to place more emphasis on the relative difference in values among the alternatives than on the absolute value for each alternative. The modeling techniques used in the Study were developed to measure the effects of changing the CWCP and not to forecast the future. Many factors that will influence future economic and environmental performance were not modeled.

Each section of this chapter includes one or more tables that include data broken down by river reaches. In some instances, the data for the individual reaches do not add up to the total value included in the table. This occurs because the numbers were rounded off after the totals were computed.

Finally, data specific to many of the basin Tribes will be presented. This effort was incorporated into this chapter as the Corps strives to better fulfill its Trust responsibilities to the Native American Tribes in the Missouri River basin.

Table 5.1-1. Alternatives submitted to the Corps for consideration.

Entity Submitting Alternative	Alternative Name
Missouri Levee and Drainage District Association	MLDDA
Missouri River Basin Association	MRBA
American Rivers and Missouri River Natural Resources Committee	ARNRC
Missouri Department of Conservation	MODC
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – Biological Opinion Alternative	BIOP
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – 30-kcfs Spring Rise Alternative	FWS30

This page is intentionally left blank.